DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 615 JC 830 031

AUTHOR Peterson, Tim
TITLE Part-Time Faculty Compensation and Staff Development in Three Kansas City Area Community Colleges.
PUB DATE [Dec 82]
NOTE 24p.; Graduate seminar paper, University of Missouri, Kansas City.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Employment Practices; *Faculty Development; Institutional Characteristics; *Part Time Faculty; Personnel Policy; *Teacher Salaries; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Johnson County Community College KS; Kansas City Kansas Community College; Penn Valley Community College MO

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine compensation packages and staff development provisions at Johnson County Community College (JCCC), Kansas City Kansas Community College (KCKCC), and Penn Valley Community College (PVCC). Interviews were conducted at each school with the administrators responsible for compensation and staff development and were supplemented by an examination of adjunct faculty handbooks, contracts, policy statements, and salary schedules. The study indicated that: (1) within the past 5 years, the number of adjunct faculty had increased 69% at JCCC (to 59% of the total faculty), 31% at KCKCC (to 58% of the total), and 30% at PVCC (to 39% of the total); (2) adjunct faculty had served an average of 6 semesters at JCCC, 2 semesters at KCKCC, and 4.5 semesters at PVCC; (3) compensation for full-time faculty members was two to three times higher than for part-time faculty; and (4) staff development provisions for part-time faculty at the colleges were limited, with only KCKCC having a well-defined and ongoing program. The study confirmed the conclusions drawn from the literature that part-time faculty are underpaid and neglected in terms of staff development. The study report includes a literature review, copies of adjunct faculty contracts or letters of assignment, tables showing compensation packages and staff development programs, and a bibliography. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225615

Part-Time Faculty Compensation and Staff Development in Three Kansas City Area Community Colleges

Tim Peterson

UMKC - ED 585

VC 830 031

Running Head: Part-Time Faculty Compensation and Staff Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. W. Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Abstract

The use of part-time, or adjunct, faculty in community colleges has grown so dramatically in recent years that they now exceed the number of full-time faculty in many of these institutions. Among the many controversial issues arising out of this increased usage are those of compensation and staff development for adjunct faculty.

In an effort to determine the policies and practices relevant to these two issues at three Kansas City area public community colleges, as compared to those of other institutions around the country, a review of the literature was conducted along with a survey of the appropriate administrators at Kansas City Kansas, Johnson County and Penn Valley community colleges. As expected, at both the national and local levels, adjunct faculty are typically compensated much less for their teaching than their full-time colleagues and are not afforded many, if any, opportunities for professional development.

Appendices included in this paper are the survey instrument, copies of sample adjunct faculty contracts or letters of assignment, tables showing compensation packages and staff development programs of the colleges surveyed, and a bibliography.

Table of Contents

Introduction 2

Review of the Literature

Compensation 3

Staff Development 6

The Kansas City Study

Methods and Procedures 8

Results 9

Summary and Conclusions 12

Appendices

Institutional Characteristics (Table I) 14

Compensation (Table II) 14

Staff Development (Table III) 15

Survey Instrument 16

Johnson County CC Contract 18

Kansas City Kansas CC Contract 19

Bibliography 20

Part-Time Faculty Compensation and Staff Development in Three Kansas City Area Community Colleges

Introduction

Community colleges, along with the majority of higher education, are beginning to experience stabilizing enrollments and dwindling resources. An increasing response to these circumstances has been a greater emphasis on the recruitment of nontraditional students along with a greater use or employment of adjunct faculty (Lombardi, 1975). While many administrators justify this trend in terms of cost (savings), institutional flexibility, needed expertise and community relations (Hammons, 1981), critics have suggested that the quality of instruction is compromised by the use of large numbers of adjunct faculty (Friedlander, 1980) and that they may be subject to exploitation (AAUP Report, 1981). Although these issues are not the concern of this paper per se, they do impact on or influence the issues of compensation and staff development. The net result is that adjuncts are compensated less than full-time faculty and are given few incentives or opportunities for engaging in professional development activites.

As community colleges continue to rely more heavily on adjunct faculty administrators are beginning to realize the difficulties involved with the recruitment and retention of competent, qualified and commited part-time instructors (Harris, 1980). This paper assumes that the current status of adjunct faculty compensation and staff development exacerbates those difficulties, but does not attempt to substantiate that assumption. The purpose of this paper is only that of describing the current status of these two issues nationally, via a review of the most current literature available,

and amongst Kansas City Kansas, Johnson County and Penn Valley community colleges by surveying the appropriate administrators in these institutions regarding their policies and practices.

Issues such as collective bargining, employment and termination, litigation, evaluation or tenure (other than as may be considered a part of compensation) of adjunct faculty are not addressed in this paper.

Review of the Literature

Compensation

The literature pertaining to the compensation of adjunct faculty, particularly those teaching in community colleges, is not extensive but somewhat enlightening. Most studies related to the topic have been done on a statewide basis (Hopper, 1975; Illinois Community College Board, 1978) although some have looked at selected institutions around the country (Brown, 1976; Leslie, 1982) providing a rather clear picture of what the trend has been during the past half-decade. Prior to examining specific data, however, some attention should be given to the rationale, influencing factors and methods utilized in the determination of compensation packages.

According to Friedlander (1980, p. 27) institutions realize savings "by not paying part-time teachers for course-related activities that take place outside the classroom (class preparation, office hours, attendance at department meetings, participation in professional development activities) and by excluding them from receiving fringe benefits, salary increases, and the right to earn security of employment." Lombardi (1975, p. 34) seems to agree claiming that "the logic supporting the lower pay for part-time work... was and continues to be that the extra class assignment is less ardous or requires less responsibility from the instructor than does the full-time as-

signment of the regular instructor." This ostensible justification has resulted, in most cases, in substantially lower salaries for adjunct faculty even though the arguments may not always reflect the actual workload, contribution or time spent on the job fulfilling these unassigned responsibilities.

Factors which influence salaries generally include several different variables such as the location of the institution, the labor market of the area, the reputation of the college, or others. Brown (and others, 1976) identified and examined three specific influencing factors for which data was available: 1) the average compensation for full-time faculty; 2) whether or not faculty were unionized; and 3) the enrollment size of the institution. In their study of nineteen selected community colleges around the country, they found a low correlation between all three factors and part-time salaries indicating a weak relationship or a low level of influence. A more recent set of studies, perhaps the most comprehensive and in-depth studies concerning part-time faculty, (Leslie and others, 1982) discovered that thirty percent of the colleges with collective bargining contracts prorated part-time faculty pay, clearly the method least used but that which affords the highest salaries.

The methods used to determine salaries tend to fall into one of three categories: 1) per clock or credit hour; 2) per course or by semester; or 3) a prorated amount of full-time salaries. The research cited in the literature indicates that the first of these methods is, as Lombardi (1975, p. 35) asserts, "the oldest and still most widely prevalent." In Brown's (1976) study, seventeen of the nineteen community colleges surveyed reported salaries in terms of hourly or unit rates. A study of administrative and faculty

salaries in Illinois (Ill. Community College Board, 1978) noted that a formula was used to obtain comprable data for part-time salaries because of the differing methods used in compensating them, yet expressed that data in credit hour rates.

Actual rates of pay vary considerably between colleges, but again there are some definite patterns. The Illinois study showed a range from $177-$593 with a median of $225 and a mean of $238 per credit hour for the 1977-78 academic year. In 1975-76 the average rate among the institutions in Brown's survey was a mere $157 per credit hour, reflecting only an 8.2 percent increase since 1973 for the same institutions. Leslie's (1982) study, although it included four-year colleges and universities in addition to community colleges, reported finding a range from $150-$253 but, interestingly, assumed that $275 was the average. In those institutions that do prorate salaries, which is uncommon, salaries tend to parallel those of overload or even full salaries of full-time faculty.

Compensation other than salary, such as fringe benefits, are rarely provided to adjuncts. A small percentage of institutions do provide out-of-pocket expenses, such as mileage, for activities related to the teaching assignment or for course preparation when scheduled classes have to be cancelled (Leslie, 1982). Benefits such as unemployment compensation, retirement or tenure are required by statute or law in a limited number of states such as California, Michigan and Washington where they have been won by litigation or collective bargining. Thus far, Lombardi (1975, p. 51) seems to be about half right in his proclamation of over a half-decade ago: "...a salary schedule considerably higher than the present low scale ... is a reasonable expectation for part-time teachers in the next ten years. It will come by negotiation, by state or federal mandate, or through court action."

Staff Development

Unlike the literature related to the compensation of adjunct faculty, that pertaining to their professional development is much more voluminous. Unfortunately, a great deal of it is redundant and prone to be devoid of any substance. Most of it, in general, tells the reader the following: 1) that adjunct faculty want and need staff development, but aren't getting it; 2) that a limited number of exemplary programs do exist, which are usually then described; and 3) that there are some obvious, but basic elements that must be incorporated into any program if it is to be successful (e.g., inclusion of adjuncts in the process, handbooks, articulation with full-time faculty, etc.).

Harmons (1981, p. 49-50), a prolific writer on the subject, summarizes the current situation rather succinctly when, in a recent article, he says "I do not see any issues here." Still, some questions are worth asking such as: what is the nature and extent of these programs; what kinds of programs do adjuncts want and need; and why do colleges tend to ignore this important function?

It's interesting to note that no less than six doctoral dissertations have focused on part-time faculty development in some respect or another over the past decade. All these dissertations reported findings of inadequate programs. In Pennsylvania (Bauer, 1977), California (Sewell, 1976), Michigan (Fent, 1979), the midwest (Seitz, 1971) and the southeast (Balboni, 1975) it was found that, in Fent's words (p. 36), "the present status of adjunct faculty at most community colleges is one of neglect." Only thirty-nine percent of the institutions in his study had any professional development program for adjuncts, and most of those were informal activities (i.e., handbooks, orien-

tation sessions, etc.); only five percent included adjuncts in programs provided to full-time faculty; and none compensated them for participating in any of these activities.

One particularly noteworthy study on a national scale was Persinger's (1977) which included seventy-eight two year colleges in over forty states. Not surprisingly, Persinger learned that fewer than half of those colleges surveyed had any programs. Twenty percent of those that did had only informal activities such as those described above. Furthermore, like the numerous statewide studies, it was found that very few institutions offer any extrinsic incentives for participation; that all programs were voluntary and only lasted, on the average, two to four hours; and that most programs were conducted by administrators. On the bright side of the picture, if there is one, was that Persinger also discovered that the average rate of participation in the programs amongst adjunct faculty was about sixty-five percent, a relatively high rate considering the voluntary nature of the programs and the dearth of incentives.

With respect to the kinds of programs that adjuncts need and want, the literature is replete with articles, monographs, recorded speeches, etc. on the subject. Depending on whom you're surveying though, the answers will vary. Ferret (1976) asked both adjuncts and administrators, division chairpeople and full-time faculty, to list the the needs of adjuncts in rank order and reported that adjuncts listed information on job expectations as their top need whereas everyone else ranked that item next to last. Similarly, Fent (1979) reported that the adjuncts he surveyed identified the most important component of future programs as being a closer liaison with full-time faculty, but administrators thought it should be more supervision and evaluation. Almost without exception, suffice it to say that these studies have

shown that most adjuncts need or want more assistance in such areas as: job expectations, administrative structure, college philosophy, student characteristics, course preparation, teaching methods, support services and the evaluation of student learning. Without question, closer communication and interaction with full-time faculty is also desperately needed.

The reasons for which colleges have neglected this vital function are severalfold, yet simple. Hammons (1981, p. 50) suspects that "the major stumbling block is a lack of support by top administrators" although he goes on to defend them by saying "they are preoccupied with more pressing matters such as balancing a budget or fighting off intrusions on local autonomy by local, state and governmental units." It may also be that administrators, as evidenced by the differing group perceptions concerning needs described earlier, actually lack an accurate awareness of adjunct faculty needs (Smith, 1980). And, of course, there are less substantive, but important, problems such as scheduling, coordinating and promoting development programs. Because so many adjuncts work elsewhere full-time it is difficult to schedule a program or activity at a time convenient for the majority of them. Whatever the reasons, the time and costs involved are minuscule compared to the potential benefits that the instructors, the institution, and ultimately the students, may stand to gain from an effective program.

The Kansas City Study

Methods and Procedures

A uniform questionnaire, which was adapted from the instument used in the Persinger (1977) study, was employed in a series of face-to-face interviews with the administrators most responsible for compensation and staff development of adjunct faculty within each of the three institutions surveyed.

Copies of adjunct faculty handbooks, letters of assignment or contracts, policy statements and salary schedules were also requested from each institution to supplement the information provided in the personal interviews.

Results

Institutional Characteristics. A brief look at the enrollment size, number of full and part-time faculty, average length of (adjunct faculty)service to the institutions, location and setting of the colleges is given here to acquaint the reader with those factors which may have some bearing on the differences or similarities in adjunct faculty compensation and staff development at each of the institutions surveyed.

Johnson County, Kansas City Kansas and Penn Valley community colleges are all tax-supported public community colleges offering basically the same kinds of educational programs. Of the three, Johnson County has the largest student enrollment, number of full and part-time faculty, and highest average length of service. Compared to five years ago, Johnson County has also experienced the largest increase in both the number of full and part-time faculty employed. In the latter case, the growth has been so tremendous that the percentage increase is more than double that of either of the other two colleges. This growth also represents the largest increase in the ratio of part to full-time faculty within institutions, although that ratio now only slightly exceeds that of Kansas City Kansas. Thus, within the past five years, the number of adjunct faculty has increased sixty-nine percent (now fifty-nine percent of the total faculty) at Johnson County; thirty-one percent (now fifty-eight percent of the total) at Kansas City Kansas; and thirty percent (now thirty-nine percent of the total) at Penn Valley.

Regarding enrollment size and length of service, Johnson County reported a

headcount of 7,800 and an average of six semesters taught by adjuncts; Kansas City Kansas had the low figures for both factors reporting headcount of only 4,000 and a two semester average; and Penn Valley reported having 6,800 students and a 4.5 average.

Finally, it should also be noted that both Johnson County and Kansas City Kansas are single county controlled institutions located in surburban settings on the Kansas side of the metropolitan area whereas Penn Valley is but one of four community colleges in a district serving several counties in Missouri. Penn Valley is also located in the midtown part of Kansas City and thus might be considered to be more of an urban institution.

Compensation. As expected, and in keeping with the results of the literature search, all three of the colleges surveyed reported similiar compensation packages for adjunct faculty. All pay on a per-credit-hour basis, but only Johnson County has a salary schedule tied to length of service. In their case, new adjunct faculty start at $250, move to $275 during the third semester, and peak at $300 when they've reached their seventh semester of teaching. Kansas City Kansas and Penn Valley, on the other hand, pay only a flat rate, $275 and $300 respectively, regardless of their adjuncts' longevity at the college.

Comparing these rates to the average salaries of full-time faculty at the same colleges shows that, not accounting for non-teaching responsibilities, full-time faculty command markedly higher rates. By dividing the average full-time salaries by the average course load taught at each institution, the per-credit-hour rates for full-time faculty would be $825.97 at Johnson County, $687.50 at Kansas City Kansas, and $633.33 at Penn Valley. When these rates are considered along with the average percentage increase in full-time salaries as compared to that for part-time rates (thirty vs. fourteen percent) over the

past five years, it becomes clear who the financial losers are at the colleges. While none of the institutions reported that it was by design, all admitted that their adjunct faculty rates were, except for summer, equal to the overload rates negotiated by the (full-time) faculty bargining unit.

In terms of fringe benefits, adjuncts at Johnson County and Penn Valley are granted one sick day per course taught, but none at Kansas City Kansas. The only other "bennies" given to adjuncts are eligibility for departmental travel funds and small grants program awards, although these might also be considered staff development opportunities, at Johnson County. However, few adjuncts there ever take advantage, or are probably even aware of, these opportunities.

Staff Development. When examining the staff development programs for adjunct faculty of the three colleges, it became obvious that only Kansas City Kansas had a well-defined, on-going program.

Johnson County and Penn Valley, like most of the institutions described in the literature, provide only one formal two-to-four hour orientation session a year for adjunct faculty, both of which are scheduled early in the fall semester. Attendance is mandatory for new and returning adjuncts alike and without pay. Both sessions only address administrative and departmental concerns or issues. Neither program is developed as the result of adjunct faculty input nor is evaluated in any way. Beyond this, adjuncts are merely given a handbook (only one page is exclusively devoted to adjuncts in Penn Valley's) and some encouragement to seek out administrators, division chairpeople or other full-time faculty it assistance is needed.

Until this current academic year, efforts at staff development at Kansas

City Kansas were essentially the same as those at the other two colleges. Numerous changes have recently occured there though including: an orientation session every semester for new adjuncts; a monthly newsletter specifically designed for them; the offering of two teaching clinics every semester for which a $25 stipend is paid per clinic; the establishment of an adjunct faculty staff development committee; the appointment of a full-time faculty (on released time) member from each academic division to serve as an instructional consultant to adjuncts within the division, rather than as a supervisor; and an annual survey of adjunct faculty staff development needs.

Understandably so, the participation of adjunct faculty in mandatory sessions tends to be quite high (seventy to ninety-five percent) since failure to do so might, at least tacitly, jeopardize future employment. Kansas City Kansas, however, reported low participation (less than ten percent) in its teaching clinics even when a stipend was paid. Nevertheless, that college anticipated a continuation of the newly-established program.

Summary and Conclusions

According to the literature, adjunct faculty in most community colleges are underpaid and neglected, at least as far as staff development is concerned.

The same is true, for the most part, in Kansas City area community colleges as revealed by this study. It can be reasonably assumed that compensation for adjuncts in the Kansas City area has remained low, and at a relatively static, level for the past half decade because of labor market conditions (i.e., an abundant supply of part-time instructors in most discipline areas). Additionally, the policies and practices relating to staff develop-

ment for adjuncts at the institutions surveyed seem to be in line with those of other community colleges around the country. And, unless labor market conditions were to drastically change or adjuncts themselves were to push for increased compensation or staff development opportunities, it appears that no major changes in either area will soon occur.

TABLE I

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

	JCCC	KCKCC	PVCC
Headcount	7,800	4,000	6,800
No. FT Faculty	151 (+21%)	94 (+9%)	100 (-23%)
No. PT Faculty	213 (+69%)	128 (+31%)	65 (+30%)
FT Faculty 5 yrs ago	125	86	130
PT Faculty 5 yrs ago	126	98	50
Av. No. Semesters (PT)	6	2	4.5

TABLE II

COMPENSATION

Av. FT Faculty Salary	$24,779 (+44%) $825.97	$20625* (+37%) $687.50	$19,000 (app.) (+10%) $633.33
PT Faculty Rate/Range	$250-$300 (0%)	$275 (+22%)	$300 (+20%)
Method	per credit hr.	per credit hr.	per credit hr.
Last Increase	1977-$25	1982-$25	1982-$10
FT Salary 5 yrs ago	$17,220	$15,106*	$17,250 (app.)
PT Salary 5 yrs ago	same	$225	$250
Fringe Benefits	1 sick day eligible for dept travel funds + small grants program	none	1 sick day

* median of salary range

TABLE III

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

	JCCC	KCKCC	PVCC
FT Faculty Program (pre/in-service)	both	both	both
PT Faculty Program	pre	both	pre
Invited to FT Programs	yes	yes	no
Voluntary/Mandatory	mandatory	varies	mandatory
Paid for Participating	no	$25 per clinic	no
% Participation	95%	varies	70%
Scheduled	fall	on-going	fall
Length	2-4 hr.	9 hr.	2-3 hr.
Goals	admin/dept	admin/dept/ teaching	admin/dept
Group Size	large/small	small	large/small
PT Faculty Involvement	none	survey/comm.	none
Evaluation of Program	none	"knee jerk"	none
Person Responsible	Staff & Curr. Specialist	Ad. Faculty Director	Associate Dean of Instruction

College:_____ Person Interviewed:_____
Title:_____

1. Current headcount enrollment?_____ 2. No. FT faculty?_____ 3. No. Ad faculty?_____

4. Average no. semesters taught at this college by Ad faculty?_____

5. Average salary of FT faculty_____per_____? 6. Ad faculty_____per_____?

7. No. FT faculty employed 5 years ago?_____ 8. Ad faculty?_____

9. Average FT faculty salary 5 years ago_____per_____? 10. Ad faculty_____per_____?

COMPENSATION

1. How do you pay Ad faculty? _____by credit hour _____by course _____by clock hours _____proration of FT salary _____other (descibe)

2. Describe your Ad faculty salary schedule/rates?

3. What criteria is used to determine the schedule or rates? _____senority _____evaluation results _____board/admin. decision _____staff develop. activities _____tied to FT overload pay _____other (describe)

4. When was the last time the schedule or rates were increased and by how much?

5. What fringe benefits are granted to your Ad faculty? _____insurance _____sick leave _____sabbaticals/released time _____tenure _____travel/prof. develop. money _____other (describe)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Do you have a prof. develop. program for FT faculty? _____ Pre or In-service or both?

2. For Ad faculty? _____ Pre or In-service or both?

3. Are these seperate or combined programs?

4. Are these voluntary or mandatory?

5. Are Ad faculty paid for participating? _____ How much?_____per_____

6. Other incentives for participation?

7. What percentage of Ad faculty normally participate?

3. When are these programs normally scheduled?

9. What is the total length of the program for Ad faculty per term?_____days_____hours

10. Check the items below which relate to the goals of your prof. develop. program:

_____orientation to college academic, business procedures
_____ " " philosophy
_____ " " curriculum
_____ " " students
_____ " " facilities, equipment, services, personnel
_____assistance with course preparation and planning
_____training in teaching methods, strategies, etc.
_____other (describe)

11. Check items which characterize the program:

_____college wide
_____dept. program
_____large group
_____small groups
_____individualized
_____consultant instructed
_____administrator instructed
_____faculty instructed
_____multi-media utilized
_____other (describe)

12. Are any Ad faculty involved with the planning, implementation and evaluation of the program? If so, how and to what extent?

13. How often, and in what ways, is the program evaluated?

14. Title of the person(s) responsible for the program?

15. Additional pertinent information regarding the program.

Confidential

PRS 9[illegible] (1/80)

JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE BOULEVARD AT QUIVIRA ROAD, OVERLAND PARK, KS 66210
PERSONNEL STATUS MEMORANDUM B - SUPPLEMENTAL CONTRACT 18

SECTION A - To be completed by Division Director at time of hiring agreement and held pending class making:

Employee Name_____ Branch_____ Division_____

Position_____ Beginning_____

Employment under this contract will terminate on_____

			Appointment Salary or Rate of Pay	
			Non-Credit	Credit - Rate Per Credit Hour
____ New Employees	____ Salaried	____ Full time	No. of Semesters Taught at JCCC____	$250 - First Academic Year_____
____ Replacement	____ Hourly	____ Part time		$275 - Second & Third_____
____ Overload	____ Student	____ Permanent	Hourly_____	$300 - Fourth and More_____
____ Substitute		____ Temporary	Other_____	Other_____

Position Description/Assignment

"I accept the employment position indicated above according to the terms specified. I understand that my employment by the College is contingent upon (1) the availability of sufficient budgetary funds, (2) sufficient enrollment as determined by the College, and (3) approval by the Board of Trustees. I agree to abide by the rules, orders, and regulations of the College and agree to report for duty on the date(s) specified. This will certify that I have read the Adjunct Staff Agreement on the reverse side of this document and agree to be bound by all the terms and provisions thereof. I further certify that all information contained herein is correct."

Employee's Signature_____ Date_____

SECTION B - To be completed by Division Director only after hiring is affirmed by employee's signature:

Full Address_____ ZIP Code_____

Telephone_____ Social Security Number_____ Date of Birth_____

Sex_____ Marital Status_____ No. of Exemptions Claimed on W-4_____

SECTION C - To be completed by Division Director and routed to Branch Administrator after classes confirmed for payment:

Payment Dates	Account Number(s)	Assignment Total

Total for All Assignments:_____

Comments:

_____ _____
Certified - Division Director or Supervisor Date

SECTION D - To be reviewed and signed by Branch Administrator and/or President and routed to Personnel for payroll processing and filing:

_____ _____
Approved - Branch Administrator Date

_____ _____
Approved - Assistant to the President Date

_____ _____
Approved - President (Necessary for exceptions only) Date

_____
Board Approval Date

This form must be completed to effect all employee ADDITIONS. No Payroll action shall precede this form.

Note: Original to Personnel; Green Copy to Payroll; Yellow Copy to Dean; Pink Copy to Division Director; Goldenrod Copy to Employee.

2

The plans to offer this course and to have you teach it are as firm as we can now envision them. Only some unforeseen circumstances substantially affecting our schedules or curriculum will alter these plans. If, for instance, courses that are at present scheduled to be taught by full time instructors do not have sufficient registration, it may be necessary to assign this course to one of them in order to complete his/her normal teaching load. The terms of this agreement also assume that the class will have the necessary minin number of students. If fewer than the minimum number of students enroll, the instructor will have the option of teaching the course at pro-rated pay.

Course Number(s) and Title(s): _____
_____
_____

Day(s) Scheduled: _____
Time(s) Scheduled: _____
Semester: _____
Credit Hours: _____
First Class Meeting: _____
End of Semester: _____
Grades Due: _____
Class(es) Held At: _____
Salary: _____, without pro-ration.

Please indicate your willingness to teach this course, if the Board of Trustees approves this recommendation, by signing the original copy of this letter, and return it to me within one week from the date of the letter.

Sincerely,

Patricia W. Caruthers, Ph.D.
Assistant to the President

PWC:cr
enclosure

_____ _____
Date Signature

Home phone: _____

Work phone: _____

Bibliography

Balboni, H. W. A Study of Characteristics, Preparations and Goal Perceptions of Part-Time Community College Instructors in the Southeast. Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1975.

Bauer, W. K. A Study of Policies and Procedures Employed in the Utilization of Part-Time, Continuing Education/Community Service Instructional Personnel at Pennsylvania Community Colleges. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1977.

Bender, L. W., and Breuder, R. L. Part-Time Teachers - "Step Children" of the Community College. Community College Review, 1973, 1, 29-37.

Brown, B. and Romoser, R. C. Part-Time Faculty Salary Rates 1973-74 and 1975-76 for Selected Community Colleges. Cleveland, Ohio: Cuyahoga Community College, 1976.

Fent, J. E. Professional Development for Adjunct Faculty in Michigan Community Colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, 1979.

Ferrett, S K. The Implementation of a Staff Development Program for Part-Time Faculty in a Community College Based on Havelock's Theoretical Model of the Change Process: A Case Study. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1976.

Friedlander, J. Instructional Practices of Part-Time Faculty. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 2, 27-36.

Grymes, R. J., Sr. Staff Development for Adjunct Faculty. Unpublished paper, 1977.

Hammons, J. O. Adjunct Faculty: Another Look. Community College Frontiers, 2, 46-53.

Harris, D. A. From the President's Perspective: Part-Time Faculty in the 1980's. New Directions for Community Colleges, 1980, 2, 13-16.

Hopper, F. L. A Study of the Policy of Hourly Wages for Part-Time Instructors of Community Colleges in California. Unpublished paper, 1973.

Illinois Community College Board. Faculty and Administrative Salaries in the Public Community Colleges of Illinois 1977-78. Data and Characteristics, Vol. VI. Springfield, Illinios: 1978.

Lombardi, J. Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges. Topical Paper No. 54. Los Angeles, Calif.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1975.

Lombardi, J. Salaries for Part-Time Faculty: New Trends. An ERIC Review. Community College Review, 1976, 3, 77-78.

Leslie, D. W. and others. Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education. New York: Praeger, 1982.

Persinger, G. R. Professional Development for Part-Time Faculty. Research and Demonstration Project. Wheeling, Va.: Council for North Central Community and Junior Colleges, 1977.

Price, F. H. and Lane, W. H. An Analysis of Community and Junior College Use of Part-Time Faculty. Unpublished paper, 1976.

Seitz, J. E. Professional Orientation and Attitudes of Part-Time Junior College Faculty. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinios University, 1971.

Sewell, D. H. An Investigative Study of Part-Time Instructors in California Community Colleges. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976.

The Status of Part-Time Faculty (AAUP Subcommittee Report). Academe, 1981, 1, 29-39.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Jr. Colleges
8118 Math Sciences
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

March 4, 1983